

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/806,600	Applicant(s) BOHNISCH ET AL.	
	Examiner Dan Washburn	Art Unit 2628	

All Participants:

 (1) Dan Washburn.

 (2) Dan Radler.
Status of Application: pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 April 2006
Time: 2 pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 16, and 18 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 4, 16, and 18

Prior art documents discussed:

Minyard et al. (US 6,891,920)
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



ULKA CHAUHAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed that Mr. Radler's arguments with regard to claims 16 and 18 are persuasive, therefore claims 16 through 19 are found to be allowable. Examiner asked Mr. Radler if his clients would like to cancel claims 1-15 to put the application in allowable form. Mr. Radler consulted his clients and instead proposed amending claim 1 to put claims 1-15 in allowable form as well. The proposed amendment was adding the language, "in a mutually dependent manner" to the end of claim 1. The added claim language didn't put claim 1 in allowable form so the examiner didn't enter the amendment. Instead the Examiner sent out an advisory action indicating that claims 16-19 are allowable, claims 3 and 4 are objected to, and claims 1, 2, and 5-15 stand rejected.